DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 174 PS 018 565

AUTHOR Galton, Maurice
TITLE Dissemination of the Project's Findings. National Seminar--Norway (9th, Kristiansand, Norwary, October 13-14, 1988). The CDCC's Project No. 8: "Innovation in Primary Education."
INSTITUTION Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
REPORT NO DECS/EGT(88)70
PUB DATE 16 Oct 89
NOTE 22p.; For related documents, see PS 018 563-566.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Demonstration Programs; Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; *Elementary Education; Futures (of Society); Scheduling; School Entrance Age; Science Education
IDENTIFIERS *Norway

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a conference that disseminated to Norwegian parents and educators the findings of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Cooperation's Project No. 8, "Innovation in Primary Education." The main address was given by Professor Maurice Galton of the School of Education, University of Leicester, United Kingdom, who described the core dimensions of the project and the results of an analysis of the styles of innovation reported in case studies. A Norwegian perspective on Project No. 8 was offered by Mrs. Laila Brunvand, the rector of Vardasen Primary School, Kristiansand. The rector summarized the main features of the project's contact school plan and described the role of the Vardasen school in the project. Participants discussed issues in groups organized around the topics of the process of starting school--length of school days, science education, differentiated teaching, and leadership in schools. A second address, by Chief Director Oddvar Vormeland, of the Royal Ministry of Church and Education, concerned a rational framework for the development of primary education. Concluding material includes reports on group discussions and the final plenary session, in which speakers gave their views on priorities for the future. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315174

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

DECS/EGT (88) 70

Project No. 8:
"Innovation in primary education"

Dissemination of the project's findings

9th National Seminar:
Norway - Kristiansand, 13-14 October 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Europe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 018365

Council for Cultural Co-operation
School Education Division

Strasbourg 1989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Strasbourg, 16 October 1989 DECS/EGT (88) 70
ADECSEGT88.70

The CDCC's Project No. 8
"Innovation in Primary Education"

DISSEMINATION OF THE PROJECT'S FINDINGS
9th NATIONAL SEMINAR:

NORWAY

KRISTIANSAND, 13 - 14 October 1988

Report written by Maurice GALTON
Professor of Education
School of Education, University of Leicester

The points of view expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION (CDCC)
School Education Division

Strasbourg 1989

1. OPENING OF THE SEMINAR: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

After singing a song, the delegates to the conference were welcomed by the Rector of the Kristiansand College of Education, where the seminar was held. The Rector, Mr. Trygve Breiteig, extended a cordial welcome to everyone, particularly the officials from the Norwegian Ministry of Church and Education, and the representatives of the CDCC, Ms Giulia Podestà and Professor Maurice Galton. Mr. Breiteig argued that there was much to be learnt from the reports and papers of Project No 8, particularly the importance placed upon developing better understanding of the 'world of the child'. This was the first conference to take place in Norway to concern itself with this important issue and Mr. Breiteig was most pleased that it was taking place at the Kristiansand College of Education. The present generation of children were meeting a new world, one in which there was an explosion of knowledge demanding new teaching techniques and materials. Everything began in the primary school and we needed to take these first years seriously otherwise everything else would fail. Primary education was not simply about intellectual development but about the quality of life. Primary education needed adequate resources if it were to perform effectively its important role in the development of children.

Replying to this welcome the Secretary of State for the Norwegian Ministry of Church and Education, Mr. Johan Solheim, commended the work of Project No. 8. The Secretary of State said that Norway had much to learn from the report of the project and from the activities upon which the report was based. At the same time Norway must not be ashamed of its own contribution to the work of the project. Many countries had been interested in what Norway had to offer and Mr. Torleiv Vaksvik, Norway's representative, had been an excellent ambassador. The major challenge facing the educational community in Norway was how to set out the principles outlined in the project within three broad areas of challenge. The first of these involved the ecological crisis so that our children would understand the need to perserve our natural environment for future generations. The second area concerned the need for our children to develop a respect and love for the counryside in the face of increasing industrialisation. The third challenge was to ensure that future generations gave proper consideration to the children of poor countries of the world so that these children were able to believe in the future.

Finally Mr. Solheim expressed the thanks of the Ministry of Church and Education for the report of the CDCC and for the presence of its representatives Ms Giulia Podestà and Professor Maurice Galton at the seminar.

In reply Mr. Torleiv Vaksvik, the Director of Schools in Vest-Agder, expressed his pleasure that the Minister had endorsed the importance of the work of Project No. 8. He then outlined the methods of working of the project as described in Appendix 1 of the Final Report by Mr. Georges Baert. Mr. Vaksvik then continued by pointing out some of the differences between the Norwegian system of schooling and that of the other countries who took part in the project. Unlike many countries, Norway had an integrated system of education from the age of seven to sixteen which was truly comprehensive and which avoided streaming. Norway was also proud of the leading role it had

taken in supporting parental involvement in schools. Parents were asked to help their children read for fifteen minutes a day and were now being asked to help with homework. Teacher-pupil ratios were extremely low compared to some of the other member countries and time was allowed for teachers to plan and reflect on their work.

On the other hand, there were certain areas where Norway could learn from the other members of Project No. 8. Normal schooling started in Norway at seven and this was contrary to the trend in other countries, particularly Holland and the United Kingdom where increasing numbers of children were beginning school at four. It was hoped that Norway would move rapidly to a starting age of six years and attempts had been made here in Kirstiansand to begin this process. However, there was a need for more debate about the kinds of schooling which would be provided during this extra year. Like other European countries developments in the mass media, particularly television, were having an increasing influence on the culture and this trend was challenging some of the basic principles upon which the Norwegian system of schooling had been developed. The increase in one parent families was also a problem. Within this family structure the parent often had to work long hours and had little time left for the children. Those responsible for developing the educational system had to face the consequences of these changes. There was a need for continual research to build upon what we know already from the work of Project No. 8.

Another important issue related to the development of technology with the child as an inventor and discoverer. Norway had a long way to go in comparison with some other countries as there were, at the moment, very few links between education and industry. Norway also needed to take account of the changing natural rhythms of the child. Many children now watched TV until 9.30 p.m. each evening yet schools started at 8.30 a.m. next morning. Perhaps, in the circumstances, this was too early. Finally, Mr. Vaksvik said that we needed to look closely at the question of standards. As in other countries, there was a tendency to blame the ills of society on schools and to claim that standards have fallen. Mr. Vaksvik thought that schools have never been as good as they were today. The question, however, was, how could we demonstrate this fact. There was much to be done in developing methods of evaluation and assessment which take account of the complex aims of primary teaching.

Replying to the welcome by the previous speakers, Ms Giulia Podestà, Head of the School Education Division of the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport of the Council of Europe, conveyed to the Norwegian authorities the warmest thanks of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr. Marcelino Oreja, for convening this seminar in Kristiansand, as well as his best wishes for a fruitful dialogue amongst those who were attempting to implement the recommendations of the Final Report of the CDCC's Project No. 8 on Innovation in Primary Education. Mr. Oreja's strong belief in the paramount importance of education to the enhancement of human rights and democracy had prompted him to introduce the debate on education held at the recent parliamentary assembly last May. In this presentation, Mr. Oreja, had put forward three main themes, education and employment, education and citizenship and education and equality of opportunity. In arguing for an enhancement of a real European dimension at all levels of

education, Mr. Oreja stressed the need to recognise that the school maintains a central, although not unique role in the educational process. As a result, it was important for all member states to seek an improvement in the quality of teaching both at initial and in-service levels and to provide teachers with the status and resources they deserved in order to prepare future generations not only for work and employment in a society characterised by a constant and rapid development in all spheres but also for life in a democratic and multicultural community.

All these ideas were strongly supported during the ensuing assembly debates and the same ideas were fully developed within the report of Project No. 8. During the same debate, the Luxembourg Minister of Culture, representing the then Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, stressed the need to create "a genuine Europe of academic intelligence rather than a Europe of diplomas alone."

Ms Podestà then went on to summarise the main message of Project No. 8 - that the way in which innovation is inroduced or disseminated is as important as the contents of the innovation itself. Innovation was conceived as a dynamic process which entails a search for a new equilibrium to offset the imbalances resulting from various pressures on the educational system, whether due to economic and demographic factors or to internal demands resulting from and increased knowledge about the psychological development of children.

The main themes of the report were co-operation and interaction and a concern to reconcile individualism and team work both as regards teachers and pupils. The project had seen primary education as extending beyond basic sills of reading, writing and arithmetic so that it stimulates the general development of children according to their full physical and intellectual potential. These aims demanded far reaching curriculum reform and an overhaul of the initial and in-service training systems. The Project Group was avare of literature concerning the school crisis, the genesis of this crisis and the possible remedy. But it was obvious that school systems had to cope with a series of contradictory pressures: they should not only take into account economic and social fluctuations but also seek to shed light on the reasons for these changes. Above all the education system should prevent anything that stifled teachers' eagerness to teach and childrens' eagerness to learn. Project No. 8 accepted these objectives as part of the very philosophy underlying its conclusions and recommendations.

Finally, Ms Podestà expressed her warmest thanks to the representatives of Norway on Project No. 8, Mr. Torleiv Vaksvik and Mrs. Laila Brunvand, the Principle of the Norwegian school which was part of the contact school plan. She also expressed thanks to the principal lecturer, Professor Maurice Galton, for his contribution to the project and hoped that the seminar would be a source of inspiration for conveiving, launching and managing innovation within the Norwegian school system.

2. MAIN ADDRESS I: PROJECT NO. 8, INNOVATION IN PRIMARY EDUCATION, TRENDS, AIMS AND PROBLEMS

Lecturer: Professor Maurice Galton, University of Leicester, School of Education, United Kingdom and Consultant to Project No. 8

Professor Galton explained that Project No. 8 was about change and innovation in schools and how to bring this about. The project was not mainly concerned about the kind of changes which involved improvement of techniques such as how to programme the computer or learning a new method of teaching reading. The main concern of the project was to do with changing people - that is, the children's approach to learning, the teacher's role in that process and the way in which administrators and advisers, helped teachers to achieve these goals.

Professor Galton explained that the Project's concern with innovation had arisen because of our increased knowledge about children's development, particularly in our understanding of learning as a social as well as as a cognitive activity. Further, we lived in an era of rapid social change and schools had to respond to these challenges. Within the project there had been many concerns relating to matters such as multi-culturalism, the role of women in society, the integration of the handicapped into the normal school and the need for children to cope with new technology. For the project, therefore, innovation meant the adaptation of a school system to a set of demands originating not only in the development of society but also in the expansion of our knowledge of child development.

Implicit in this definition was the understanding that all change, no matter at what level within the system it originates, had effects on the other parts also. In particular, innovation always had important consequences for the relationship between teaching and learning in the classroom. It was for this reason that the project had endorsed the suggestion of Professor Vandenberghe for background mapping (Appendix IV: Final Report p. 152) where instead of starting from the central or local policymakers view and describing steps to take and problems to overcome, policymakers attempted to identify the problems that schools were likely to face during the implementation stage at classroom and school level. The aim of this approach was to reduce as many unanticipated consequences as possible during the innovation process.

Professor Galton then went on to describe the results of an analysis of the styles of innovation described in the case studies. He outline the positive and negative effects of different approaches and explained why the project argued for a mixed approach in which local communities were able to take account of their own particular needs within a general framework. In particular, he endorsed the project's recommendation for approaches which brought neighbouring schools together to work in clusters involving training team and cascade approaches (see Final Report, p. 53).

Consideration was also given to the needs of teachers as set out in the results of a survey carried out among staff in the contact schools (Final Report, p. 55-57). Here, Professor Galton placed particular emphasis on the need to give teachers time to work together

and the need for consultative support. He argued strongly that where course based innovation was carried out it was necessary to take at least two teachers from each of the schools involved so that when staff returned to their own institution they had a partner who had undergone similar experiences during the period of in-service training.

Finally, Professor Galton raised the issue of teacher training and the need, identified in the Final Report, (p. 76) to look for ways in which initial and in-service training could be more closely co-ordinated.

3. PROJECT NO. 8: A NORWEGIAN PERSPECTIVE

Speaker: Mrs. Laila Brunvand, Rektor, Vardasen Primary School, Kristiansand

Mrs. Brunvand summarised the main features of the working of the contact school plan as set out in Project No. 8 publication CDCC (88) 15 and in particular the role of the Vardasen school in Kristiansand, the Norwegian school represented in the contact school plan. The latter details were contained in a report of visits to the school carried out by Ms S. Jønsdottir (DECS/EGT (86) Misc 11).

4. QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THE MAIN ADDRESS

Following Mrs. Brunvand's presentation, she and Professor Galton then answered questions. In reply to a questioner who asked how schools could deal with ineffective teachers who were not interested in innovation Professor Galton stressed the value of internal accountability. Teachers had to accept that they were responsible to parents, the pupils and their fellow teachers and needed to be able to give an account of how they exercised this responsibility. These forms of accountability were very different from the more formal kind of external accountability which existed between the teachers and the local or national authorities. Internal accountability needed to be based on evaluation. Such evaluations were not only based upon quantitative measures. However, where qualitative judgements were used then such judgements should be capable of being assessed through observation. Once such a system was generally accepted within the school community it was very difficult for anyone to stay outside the programme of school improvement. Professor Galton rejected the notion that one could identify good and bad teachers in terms of specific criteria. Such approaches had tended, in the United States, to lead to the use of very simplistic measures with teachers emphasising the more formal aspects of the curriculum.

Mrs. Brunvand emphasised the need for teachers to have time to work on a project. Much discussion also centred on the appropriate starting age for primary school. There was strong agreement among participants that this should be reduced from seven to six years of age. Allied to this lowering of the starting age it was also felt that the number of lessons per week should be increased so that children spent a longer time at school from the age of seven. If the school day was lengthened it would be important to ensure that the curriculum was widened so that children did not just have "more of the same". Another speaker made a strong plea for schools to focus on the

needs of the pupil rather than on the system. In the speaker's opinion schools spent a vast amount of time trying to satisfy all their different clients but Norway was not a homogeneous society. There was a plurality of values and it was perhaps time for teachers to get on and do the things that they know had to be done. Professor Galton, however, cautioned against this view. He believed that it was important for teachers to reflect critically on their practice so that they could influence other teachers and also justify their ideas to those in the community who might have genuine concerns about the effect of innovation.

5. GROUP DISCUSSION

The conference then broke up into groups.

Group 1	-	Starting School - length of school days	
Speaker	-	Liv Kari B. Tonnessen	1. amanuensis
Rapporteur	-	Godvin Drangsland	1. consultant
Group 2	-	Science Education	
Speaker	-	Anne Lea	researcher, science
Rapporteur	-	Anne Berit Skeie	teacher
Group 3	-	Differentiated Teaching	
Speakers	-	Laila Brunvand and Annhild Bartha	teacher
Rapporteur	-	Sigrun Vormeland	headteacher
Group 4	-	Leadership in Schools	
Speakers	-	Synnove Dunsaed, Odd Magne Roynas, Gunnar Berg	headmasters
Rapporteur	-	Inger Fauske	school consultant

6. ADDRESS II: DEVELOPMENT OF PRIMARY EDUCATION

Chief Director Oddvar Vormeland, The Royal Ministry of Church and Education

Mr. Vormeland began by reminding his audience that in an effective school system there was a need to keep "the pot boiling" so that there were always new ideas available. Those, like himself, who worked within the bureaucracy still retained views as educationalists. Their role was to try and stand back to see what has happened, what is happening and what needs to happen in the future.

Mr. Vormeland stressed the importance of the initiative which the Council of Europe had taken in setting up Project No. 8. In Norway it was very important to consider the early years of schooling. While many valuable developments had occurred in Norway, no one could be sure of what exactly had taken place as a result. Everyone concerned hoped that the developments which various projects had initiated had been effective but there was perhaps a need now to make a survey in order to be sure. Only then would the evidence be available upon which to build the next step. Mr. Vormeland explained that he was talking about the role of the school and that people both in and out of school must now look back to see what has happened.

While it was true that consultants could give considerable feedback, their view would only be a partial one. In recent years, there must have been nearly one thousand different projects which had produced considerable optimism. Different schools had undergone many developments. But all this research was widely spread out. There was no central co-ordinating institute which could monitor and collect all the information which must have resulted in these new developments.

Mr. Vormeland argued that, nevertheless, there were several good reasons why there should be further developments based upon a careful analysis of what had been carried out already. First, there was now new knowledge and insights into child psychology and on the effects of different kinds of teaching upon the child's learning. It was necessary to summarise these developments to see what other things must be done. Second, there continued to be a conflict between theory and practice and it was important to evaluate the current position. Some saw this debate in terms of a pendulum swinging back and forth so that now the emphasis was on more theory while at other times greater attention was given to practice. Sometimes (he) Mr. Vormeland, tended to think that the controversy between different schools of educational thought was unsuited to the analogy of the pendulum. In some ways it was a vicious circle, particular as far as the curriculum was concerned, so that outdated material was now being recycled. Even since the publication of the master plan of 1987 there had been new thinking about developments in the curriculum. It followed, therefore, that research and development must not stop.

Mr. Vormeland continued by saying that the next area where development was needed involved the complete school. It was necessary to consider the changes that this initiative required in both methods and in curriculum. At the moment, there was a tendency only to consider schools in terms of the seven to ten age group. Another area for development concerned the debate about the length of the school day. It was important to ensure if this happened, that the curriculum was widened so that during the extra hours in school pupils were not taught more of the same. It was also important to clarify ideas about the purposes of the pre-primary school and the continuity with the primary school. Already there had been at least three plans although discussions about beginning school at six were still at an early stage. Finally, there was a need to consider the introduction of more creative work into school, not only in terms of activity but, also, of content.

Mr. Vormeland then turned to the issue of how teachers could cope with so many new ideas. There was a danger that some might become confused by so much innovation and regress to old ways. Such teachers needed support. At the other extreme some teachers were so interested in what was new that they paid no attention to what has gone before. Yet schools and their teachers had to meet and deal with contradictory ideas from a society concerned to maintain what was good from the past while equipping pupils to face an uncertain future. In Norway there now existed very complex networks between teachers and the local authorities and it was sometimes difficult for a teacher to know to whom they were responsible or to whom they could turn for help in this complex situation.

It seemed clear that the education authorities had therefore to provide a framework - one main goal with common objectives. It was important to gather the good ideas of all teachers and to disseminate them more widely. The issues that such a framework would need to consider involved the relationship between different subjects within the curriculum, particularly the role of the Norwegian language. Norway was a country with scattered population and many dialects and there was always likely to be a degree of tension between local and central control. Nobody wanted a rigid system and it was an important task to design an administrative arrangement which would give sufficient flexibility while providing a set of common objectives. The educational system must ensure and utilise the potential of every child so that any set of common objectives must be built upon this principle. This suggested a need to have a good balance of both activities and content. Mr. Vormeland pointed out that development "happens in the middle of the street not in the side gutters" hence the importance of mother tongue. Learning took place not only inside but outside the school so that what was learnt outside should be transferred to other subjects.

Mr. Vormeland drew the attention of his audience to the fact that many sections of society were interested in what was going to happen in the schools and were therefore a factor in the debate about balance and continuity in the curriculum of the future. In providing a general account of themselves to society schools should be aware of what work was needed in order to improve. New methods demanded new forms of assessment and the central council would be examining this question in some detail. Mr. Vormeland then drew attention to the important points of Professor Galton's lecture. The realisation that present changes had to facilitate further changes. We needed to look for ways of trying to anticipate such consequences and plan for them. There was also a need to maintain a balance between the cognitive and social development of children. It was also very important, as stressed in Project No. 8's report, to see a new role for parents as participants in the children's learning. Mr. Vormeland concluded by saying that there were many challenges facing education in Norway. Over the next few years the educational community was going to have to decide how they were going to work and make important choices about the future. Above all, education should be dynamic. The way of going about thngs was important since the educational process did not take place in a vacuum. Everyone would do well not to take these things for granted.

7. REPORTS OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Group 1 - Starting School - Length of School Days

The group considered the situation in Norway compared to other Scandinavian countries. Accurate comparisons were difficult because of the different arrangements. Some countries operated an integrated day while others had fixed timetables. In general, it could be said that in most countries within the Council of Europe, children start school at six and have a longer day than do children in Norway. Over the first three years of schooling, it appeared that in both Denmark and Sweden children spend nearly thirty per cent more time in school. It had been estimated, for example, that in Sweden, children over the first three years of schooling, had some three thousand lessons compared to the two thousand received by Norwegian pupils.

The group expressed concern about the circumstances in which many young children found themselves. In modern society, both parents often worked and there had been cases reported in the press where six year old children were left alone all day in the home. It was generally recognised that something had to be done, something positive and not just a scheme that would fill up these hours. The discussion then centred on a number of issues.

i. The Curriculum for Six Year Old Children

The group considered a number of related questions. What should be taught to children below seven? Should the curriculum for the six year old be a preparation for schooling at seven? Should the pre-primary school strive for continuity of learning or should it simply be a preparation for primary school?

ii. The nature of the Child's Day

There was discussion about the merits of a divided system as in Sweden which included leisure activities rather than additional lessons. There was general agreement that the day should not be too structured and that it should offer opportunities to develop creative activities and for children to develop their own ideas.

iii. Parent Relationships

There was general agreement that parents needed to be brought into school so that they could contribute to their children's learning. It was pointed out that quite a number of existing initiatives were already parent led.

The group also discussed the case of one particular primary school in the northern part of the country, Spitzbergen, where the community had already lowered the school age. The group endorsed the view of the school's Assistant Headteacher, Arthur Tjemsland, that for such isolated communities the school had an important role to play as a local cultural centre.

In summary, therefore, the group agreed that the most important decisions to be taken concerned:

i. The balance between school time and leisure time and the way that these areas might be more closely integrated.

ii. The nature of the curriculum which would operate with the gradual increase in the number of school hours.

iii. The need to consider the idea of the "complete school" open for a minimum of thirty hours per week.

It was also agreed that these changes would require considerable resources for in-service training since many teachers, at present, lacked the necessary skills to extend the curriculum in this way.

Group 2 - Science Education

This group was the smallest and the rapporteur wondered if this was evidence of the importance that was currently given to science in the primary school. The group as a whole expressed great concern at present trends. It was very important in today's world, to have well trained science teachers but in Norway, as in other countries, there was a falling off in the number of applications to take science courses during initial training. It was, therefore, very important that something be done to retrain existing teachers and county education officers and headterachers must do their part in order to develop new training programmes. This would require extra courses and suitable materials.

The group also considered the need to strengthen links between secondary specialists and primary teachers in order to increase continuity. At the moment there was a tendency for each group of teachers to do things very differently. The group were also concerned at the problems facing girls and the need to appreciate the different cognitive styles of each gender. One example given in the group concerned the way in which girls and boys approached a task. In one lesson involving magnets, it was observed that boys immediately went to get equipment and got started while girls tended to read the instructions slowly with the result that "by the time they came to start there were no magnets left". The group endorsed the view that both boys and girls could learn from each other so that it was important, at an early stage, to develop the work within heterogeneous groups and to encourage children to find out from each other and not just train the teacher what they needed to know.

The group concluded that there was a need for a science journal for teachers in Norway. The group recognised the current concern about mother language teaching. One of the functions of the suggested journal would be to find ways of developing pupils' interest in their native language through science activities.

Group 3 - Differentiated Teaching

The group spent sometime sharing the different approaches which various members of the group used when identifying and responding to the needs of individual pupils. This sharing of ideas was very valuable but there was still much to do and the group considered that every school should set time aside in order to discuss this topic. The group felt that it was important to have a common platform on which such individual developments might be based including agreement about a set of common attitudes. The group, therefore, spent some time considering what future priorities should be. Among the important ideas to emerge from this discussion were:

i. The need to improve the school milieu so that the physical setting supported differentiated teaching. Specific requirements included listening corners and arrangements of working areas so that books were to hand and children could carry out their tasks without having to go to a special room for resources.

ii. Utilisation of outside areas. It was felt that the immediate surroundings outside the school could be better used as a teaching resource.

iii. Teacher training. It was agreed that teachers needed to be helped to observe more closely. In particular, teachers needed to spend time looking at special children within the normal school and the group emphasised that they were not thinking only of the problems of such children but also their strengths. Without such knowledge it was difficult for teachers to help these children develop. Helping teachers to observe children more closely should be an integral part of teacher training.

iv. The role of parents. Parents were also an important resource. They knew their children best and sometimes teachers did not listen enough to them. Much more emphasis should be placed on seeking the advice of parents.

Group 4 - Leadership in Schools

The rapporteur began by expressing the wish that everyone could have heard the presentations by the three Headteachers, each expressing different views of leadership in schools. The first speaker had stressed the importance of participation of the headteacher in everything that was going on within the school. The second emphasised the importance of organisation so that everyone concerned knew exactly what they had to do. This speaker saw the school leader as someone who went around with an oil can making sure that everything worked. Headteachers needed to take the lead in research so that long term planning was possible. The third speaker emphasised the importance of self-diagnosis. It was important for the school teacher not to be afraid to use "the surgeon's knife" and cut away things that were not useful in one's own person. Unless this was done, then it was difficult to help colleagues overcome their weaknesses. Headteachers should not be afraid to tell staff exactly what they themselves were capable of and what they could not do. In such situations, it was often possible to find colleagues whose strengths matched the Headteacher's personal weaknesses.

The group then went on to list some important matters requiring further development.

i. Increasing co-operation with parents. The group felt that it was important that parents should not only know what schools do but why.

ii. Relationship with local authority. It was important to see a school's links with the local authority as a two-way arrangement. The local authority was not only there to provide help for teachers when it was needed. It was also important for the school, through its Headteacher to influence inpsectors so that they could, in turn, influence higher authorities when it came to planning new initiatives.

iii. Training for Headteachers. The group were unanimous in calling for more training for Headteachers. Being a Head was not just a question of being recognised as a good teacher. An effective school required team work among staff in a situation where all the teachers involved were aware of the main aims of the school. Headteachers needed to be helped to understand how to achieve this climate within a framework where they still retained overall responsibility for what was taught and what colleagues did.

There then followed a general discussion of these group reports. One speaker drew attention to the fact that although the children in Norwegian schools spent less time there than in other Scandinavian countries there was no evidence that by the time they left primary school they did not know as much. This suggested, at least, that the school system in Norway was very efficient. Concern was also expressed about the position of science, particularly the problem of recruitment of science teachers. The fact that the majority of primary teachers were women and that girls showed a marked reluctance to take science courses accentuated the problem. Planning to meet this shortage should begin at once.

8. FINAL PLENARY SESSION: FUTURE PLANS

A panel of speakers gave their personal views on the priorities for the future.

1. Comments from parents' representatives

Mr. Per Sverre Rannem, the Parents' Representative, welcomed the direction which the conference had taken. There was a tendency for many people to sit back and be satisfied with the way things were. In the speaker's view the teaching profession cannot be too self-critical. There was now a "Master" plan but it still needed clarification. Among the important points for further discussion was the role of central Government in innovation, the financial arrangements for schools and the role of parents in school life. Being a teacher conveyed a certain degree of power. Parents were still uncertain what rights they had.

Schools needed to re-consider what limits they placed on the value of knowledge and on the diagnosis of children's needs. The question of testing was most important. It should be used when needed rather than when demanded by external authority.

2. Comments of Mr. Helge Vreim, Teacher Union Representative

Sometimes there was a need for exact knowledge. For the most part we needed to use the old institutions in new ways and not create new institutions. We needed to organise our own development. Much of the discussion had concerned education without discussing training. There was also a need to examine the role of industry within education. We should now be thinking of how to get past the year two thousand. We also needed to set up machinery for dissemination. There was a certain lack of communication about each other's projects.

There had been much talk at the conference about support of parents. Ideas needed to be shared if they were to be put into practice. Schools needed practical things that they could work on and evaluate. Finally, it was important to be aware that schools and colleges were just part of the total learning system. There was no need to be frightened about the prospect of lowering the age of schooling to six years. Instead teachers should unite to fight upon the children's behalf to see that they get a good education.

3. Comments of Mr. Torbjorn Omholt, Chairperson, National Council for Elementary Education

Mr. Omholt said that one of the better outcomes of the conference had been that the participants, whether teachers or administrators, had got to know one another better. There now existed an atmosphere of trust in which the goals of education could be moved forward. In planning for the future, there were certain matters that would have to be taken into account.

i. If children were to start school earlier there should be no lowering of standards.

ii. In any future developments, social learning should be considered within the school. Children should, on the other hand, still remain children and therefore not be over-directed. It was not a question of evaluating what the child has done but of considering the effects of the learning in relation to the whole community and to parents.

iii. We should not expect to come up with a single model for the school of the future. One needed to take account of other people's opinions and there were bound to be variations within different communities.

iv. Basic teacher training must not simply train teachers in existing practice.

v. If the length of the school day was increased there would be more time for Norwegian, mathematics and science. We should not, however, forget both the practical and aesthetic spheres.

vi. There was a need to look at ways of training more teachers of Norwegian. Mr. Omholt concluded that everything that happened at the conference had strengthened his belief that pupils, teachers and parents working together could bring about big changes. He endorsed the points made earlier, particularly the need to share each other's ideas.

Mr. Omholt concluded by emphasising that the conference had come up with plenty of challenges which the colleges must take up in the training of new teachers and which the central authorities needed to face in seeking to co-ordinate work so that ideas could be shared.

There then followed further questions and statements from the participants. Among the points made was the need to provide more money if teachers were not to leave the profession and the need to see more women in positions of leadership so that they could influence policy. The authorities were agreed on the need to look for ways of transferring some of the primary developments discussed to the secondary phase. The remarks of Mr. Vormeland were endorsed. It was agreed that there was a need to establish arrangements for co-ordinating the many good projects that had taken place and for evaluating their importance. The question of evaluation was also raised by a number of other speakers. It was felt that there was a need, as in other countries within the Council of Europe, to look at the issue of quality and to research the factors which distinguish between good and bad schools.

During this session the discussion was adjourned to allow representatives of a local school facing closure to speak to delegates about their concerns. Delegates heard from the Chairpoerson of the parents' association and from a number of the pupils. All delegates were impressed by the skill and clarity with which these children put their case. This reinforced the point made earlier by one delegate that although the conference had focused on renewal, teachers should not be ashamed of the good things that were already part of the system.

9. CLOSURE OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference was closed by Mr. Vormeland who thanked the organisers for all the hard work that they had put in. There had been great expectations of the conference and these had not been disappointed. Delegates could now look forward to spreading these ideas which have been developed during the last two days. The Norwegian delegation at the final conference of Project No. 8 had been inspired by what it had heard and there was great enthusiasm that this dissemination conference should be held in Norway. On behalf of all present he expressed the thanks of the delegates from the Council that they had found time to attend.

In responding, Professor Galton expressed his pleasure at what had taken place over the last two days. Everywhere within the countries participating in Project No. 8 there was the same enthusiasm for the ideas of the project and a concern to move forward. In this last session, many speakers had said what ought to be done. It was now necessary to find ways of putting these ideas into practice.

Responding directly to the points raised earlier in Mr. Vormeland's address concerning the need to co-ordinate and evaluate the present progress, Professor Galton pointed out that this was also the direction which the United Kingdom education authorities had taken. The work which he had carried out at Leicester had involved a survey of existing practice and these findings were nov being used by both local and central government to develop new programmes. Professor Galton expressed the hope that ve could now build a bridge between Leicester and Norvay and said that he would welcome visits from anyone interested in learning about the evluation techniques which were in use to study primary education in the United Kingdom.

Finally, Ms Podestà expressed thanks for the sentiments expressed by Mr. Vormeland. She remarked that Norway had always been very active within the Council. Although Norway was far away geographically from Strasbourg it had always been at the Centre of Council's activity.

APPENDIX

List of participants

Baugstø, Bjørn	Norsk spes.lærerlag, Krossen skole
Beck, Bjørg Haugen	Eik
Belstad, Anne Beate	Veståsen skole, 2022 Gjendrum
Berglyd, Ingrid Worning(kons)	4371 Eigersund
Bråthen, Kai	PPT- Hurum
Børresen, Tom Chr.(rektor)	1750 Halden
Engeland, Øystein (skoledir.)	Oslo og Akershus
Enggrav, Arnhild	Vardåsen skole
Fauske, Nina	Nanset barneskole
Floer, Elsa	9433 Sørvik
Frønæs, Jon (skolestyreform.)	4860 Treungen
Førsund, Albert O.(skolesjef)	3195 Borre
Gjernes, Nils (skoleinsp.)	Rådhuset, 3100 Tønsberg
Greibrokk, Åse	Sky skole, Larvik, Vestfold lærerlag
Grindalen, Anne Lande	2400 Elverum
Gundersen,Hans Georg	Engerdal skolekontor
Gundersen Ingrid	Engerdal skolekontor
Gusland, Else	Vestfold lærerlag, 3150 Tolvsrø
Haukeland, Edel (skoleinsp.)	Underv.sektor, Drammen skolestyre
Hansen, Arvid (kons.)	Skoledir. i Oslo og Akershus
Hanssen, Britt	Stavanger lærerskole
Hansen, Gro (fagveil.)	Tune skolekontor, 1713 Grålum
Haugland, Marie (adj.)	Nissedal, 4860 Treungen
Haugsgjerd, Håvard	Sande u-skole, 3070 Sande, Vestfold lærerlag
Hegtun, Arnhild (kons.)	Oslo og Akershus skoledir.kontor
Helgesen, Inga	NUFO-nestleder
Helø, Olaug (kons.)	Ped.senter, 9001 Tromsø
Holmerud, Inger Margrethe(veil.)	2011 Strømmen
Holt-Jensen, Brit Hellen	Borgen barneskole, Skjeberg
* Høyland, Marion	Ime skole, 4500 Mandal
Haaheim, Hild (kons.)	Skoledirektøren i Østfold

Håvik, Odd	Sogndal lærerskole, 5801 Sogndal
Håvåg, Svein	Ped.senter, 5500 Haugesund
Klev, Erik	Karl Johans Minne skole
Kleven, Ragnhild (rektor)	Furulunden skole, 4500 Mandal
Kleven, Tore (rektor)	Frøysland skole, 4550 Mandal
Klippen, Astrid (leder)	Ped.senter, 3050 Mjøndalen
Kooyman, Siri	Stavanger lærerh.skole
Kristiansen, Kjell (skolesjef)	Tune skolestyre, 1713 Grålum
Kydland, Tormod (kons)	Farsund skolekontor, 4550 Farsund
Langfjæran, Dag	Skolens landsforb.
Leandersen, Gunnvor	9000 Tromsø
Lexau, Konrad	Skoledir. i Aust-Agder
Lindseth, Anne Margrethe	Oslo lærerhøgskole
Lund, Grete	3140 Borgheim
Lundsholt, Åge (rektor)	Heistad skole, Porsgrunn
Lyngvær, Edel Lian	7004 Trondheim
Mortensen, Terje (kom.dir.)	Rådhuset, 3100 Tønsberg
Nerøy, Anne	Stavanger Lærerhøgskole
Nordahl, Tone Hessen	Svelvik barneskole, 3060 Svelvik
Nygaard, Harald (rektor)	Øberg skole, 1750 Halden
Ottøy, Harald (ped.kons.)	Karmøy, 4250 Kopervik
Palm, Grete	Ped. senter Bærum, P.b. 21, 1351 Rud
Pedersen, Marie Føreland	Vardåsen skole, Kristiansand
Pladsen, Arne (skoleinsp.)	Rådhuset, 3100 Tønsberg
Ramstad, Vigdis Kittang	Bergan skole, Duken, Vestfold lærerlag
Samuelsen, Åse Follerås	Honningsvåg bskole, 9750 Honningsv.
Setekleiv, Elna	Rønningen skole, 1370 ASKER
Skjekkeland, Martin (kons.)	Kvinesdal skolekontor
Skeie, Anne Berit	Suldal skolekontor, 4230 Sand
Skorge, Turid	Eik lærerhøgskole, 3200 Sandefjord
Solhøi, Hans Fredrik (skoleinsp.)	3195 Borre
Storfjord, Jon	Ljørdalen skole, 2420 Trysil
Strand, Kjell	PP-tjenesten, 3100 Tønsberg
Støverud, Bente Nordlie	Ullensaker vegl.tj, 2050 Gjesheim
Syvertsen, Mai Hilmer (lærer)	Fagerholt skole, 4633 Kristiansand
Sæta, Synnøve Hegge	Kroderen skole, 3515 KRØDEREN
Sødal, Kirsten	Vest-Agder lærerlag
Timenes, Øyvind	Strømme skole
Titlestad, Jo Kjell (u.insp.)	Borgen barneskole, 1740 Borgenh.
Vormeland, Sigrun (rektor)	Voksentoppen skole, Oslo
Vågsli, Liv	Brobekkveien 12 B, 0583 Oslo 3
Økland, Eli Sødal	Tysvær ped. senter, Grindafjord
Aarsund, Erik (skolesjef)	1750 Halden
Aasen, Ole Jan (kons)	Skoledir. i Vestfold, 3100 Tønsberg

+ 1 person fra Skedsmo kommn.

Forelesere:

Bartha, Annhild
Berg Gunnar, rektor
Brunvand, Laila, rektor
Dunsæd, Synnøve, rektor
Dørum, Elfie, sekretær
Galton, Maurice, professor
Lea, Anne, forsker
Omholt, Torbjørn, skoledirektør
Podestà, Ms. Giulia , Europarådet
Rannem, Per Sverre, formann i FUG
Røynås, Odd Magne, rektor
Solheim, Johan, statssekretær
Tjemsland, Arthur, u.insp.
Tønnessen, Liv Kari B., første amanuensis
Vaksvik, Torleiv, skoledirektør
Vormeland, Oddvar, ekspedisjonssjef
Vreim, Helge, skolesjef, Bø

Etteranmeldte

til

Barnetrinnspedagogikken i utvikling

13. - 14. okt. 1988

Bargem, Kirsten	Pretsåsen skole, 2030 Nannestad
Birkeland, Narve F.	Volda Lærerhøgskole, 6100 VOLDA
Hallberg, Lisbeth	Statsøvingsskolen, Kristiansnd
Holter-Dahl, Asta	Kristiansand Lærerhøgskole
Høgetveit, Anlaug	Åsane skole, Kristiansand
Høigård, Anne	Stavanger Lærerhøgskole, 4005 Stavanger
Kjellevold, Kjell	Ve skole, Kristiansand
Løvdal, Helge	Kvinesdal
Nordgarden, Torgrim	Moseidmoen skole, 4700 Vennesla
Skogli, Hans Ole	2334 Romedal
Storslett, Jostein	Leksvik skolekontor, 7120 Leksvik
Stålsett, Karl	Lillesand
Trægde, Karin	Voie skole

ROM 409

GRUPPE 1 - UTVIDET SKOLETID

Gro Hansen
Else Gusland
Mai Hilmer Syvertsen
Karin Trægde
Bente Nordlie Støverud
Liv Vågslid
Marie Føreland Pedersen
Åse Greibrokk
Åse Folleråd Samuelsen
Elsa Floer
Jon Frøynæs
Dag Langfjæran
Turid Skorge
Arne Pladsen
Harald Nygaard
Siri Kooyman
Kai Bråthen
Hans Georg Gundersen
Jostein Storslett
Anne Lande Grindalen
Karl Stålsett
Lisbeth Hallberg
Konrad Lexau
Per Sverre Rannem
Johan Solheim
Bibbi Geheb
Synnøve Hegge Sæta

27

ROM 104

GRUPPE 2 - NATURFAG PÅ BARNETRINNET

Arnhild Engrav
Marion Høyland
Hild Haaheim
Inga Helgesen
Anne Berit Skeie
Elna Setekleiv
Kjell Kjellwold
Kirsten Sødal
Håvard Haugsgjerd

9

ROM 101

GRUPPE 3 - TILPASSET OPPLÆRING

Erik Klev
Øystein Engeland
Britt H. Holt-Jensen
Inger M. Holmerud
Asta Holter Dahl
Ole Jan Aasen
Jon Storfjord
Marie Haugland
Anne Beate Belstad
Edel Lian Lyngvær
Bjørg Haugen Bech
Hans Ole Skogli
Brit Hanssen
Grete Palm
Tone Hessen Nordahl
Hj. Kjell Kristiansen
Ingrid Gundersen
Edel Haukeland
Kirsten Bargem
Sigrun Vormeland
Odd Håvik
Eli Soldal Økland
Tom Chr. Børresen

23

ROM 103

GRUPPE 4 - LEDELSE I SKOLEN

Vigdis Kittang Ramsta
Øivind Timenes
Arild Hansen
Torbjørn Omholt
Tore Kleven
Jo-Kjell Titlestad
Ragnhild Kleven
Gunvor Leandersen
Olaug Helø
Tormod Kydland
Anlaug Høgetveit
Martin Skjekkeland
Helge Vreim
Svein Håvåg
Narve F. Birkeland
Ingrid Worning Bergly
Astrid Klippen
Harald Ottøy
Arnhild Hegtun
Erik Aarsund
Kjell Strand
Torgrim Nordgarden
Anne Nerøy
Hans Fredrik Solhøi

24